



Gnashing of Teeth

"God says do what you wish, but make the wrong choice and you will be tortured for eternity in Hell. That's not free will. It's like a man telling his girlfriend, do what you wish, but if you choose to leave me, I will track you down and blow your brains out. When a man says this we call him a psychopath. When God says the same we call him 'loving' and build churches in his honor."

~William C. Easttom II

Hell. The most successful fear-tactic ever devised. Yet, there is a blatantly obvious flaw in the logic here: people will be sentenced to life in eternal pain and torment for behaving naturally. God created humans, then punished them for acting according to the natures HE ostensibly gave them.

The punishment of Hell, could not rationally be in place as a deterrent to sin, since an omniscient God would already know who and how many would be sinful and go to Hell. Since this number is in a sense pre-ordained, that number of people would be sentenced to Hell anyway, and thus, cannot act as a deterrent, since a deterrent acts to change something inherently changeable.

According to Christian dogma, those who don't know God and accept Jesus as their personal savior, are doomed to spend eternity in torment. The obvious flaw here, is that there are many people who will never even have the opportunity to be exposed to the Christian religion. What of that? If a person is not privy to the

information, how can they rightfully be condemned to a horrible eternal fate? Christians are quick to say that's why they have ministries in the far reaches of Earth. This does not, however, address the original incongruity: God has put a system in place that is neither rational, fair, nor loving.

Any reasonably loving and sane person of good mental health, who has children, will tell you that they love their children in spite of the bad things they might do. Mistakes and even egregious errors will not delete the love a parent has for the child.

The main reason for this, skipping the biological details, is that the parent created this child and that's a bond that endures. And we have so anthropomorphized God in that two-direction expressway of God creating us in his image, that we assume, perhaps without being aware of it, that God would behave toward us, much like we would behave toward our own children. Yet, we dismiss the absurdity and cruelty of this God when he threatens to send us to Hell for something as negligible as a lack of faith in him.

Parents, if your children, in a fit of pique, said they hated you, would you pour gasoline on your child and set him ablaze? Not unless you are one of those mentally deranged people we hear about periodically. So why is God any less deranged and cruel to do that to HIS children? The flaw in the logic here, is obvious.

The usual rebuttal from defending Christians is the "free will" refrain. But how is it free will to choose to love or worship a deity, when he's holding a God-sized gun to your head? I have already refuted the free will defense, and I won't belabor the point here, other than to say coercion does not inspire trust, love, devotion or respect in me. I can't speak for anyone else.

But this should, at the very least, make one question

the existence of a Hell, or God, as a benevolent being, and even make you question the existence of God altogether.



The First Spark

*"The mind is its own place, and in itself
Can make a Heaven of Hell, a Hell of Heaven."
~John Milton, Paradise Lost*

The belief in a terrifying underworld first began with the Egyptians, and their religious tome, The Egyptian Book of the Dead. This text delineates the ways in which the underworld is successfully traversed, to include the necessary spells and rituals. There were seven gates a soul had to pass through, before arriving for judgment in front of the King Osiris, which was the mythological equivalent to the Christian God.

By the 6th century BCE, the concept of Hell was embodied in the religion of Zoroastrianism, springing from the teaching of the prophet, Zoroaster. In this version, the dead were judged by walking across a paper-thin bridge called *Shin Vah*. The good souls passed over, and the condemned ones fell into the fiery pit below.

This new characterization of God began during the Babylonian Exile, when the Israelites crossed paths with followers of the prophet, Zoroaster, who lived circa 630-550 BCE. Zoroaster's adherents believe that time was divided into a current age of darkness and a future age of light, which would end in a final battle between good and evil, wherein the good would receive reward and the evil would be annihilated.

This eschatology soon became part of the Christian dogma, and appeared in apocalyptic writings such as that found in the Book of Daniel, 200 years before Jesus appeared. Though Daniel was said to have been written by the prophet of the same name 400 years preceding, it was instead written by an unknown author who told

only of disasters happening in his time. So Daniel was not a forecast, but a reporting of current events. This was just another way that Christian dogma borrowed and altered facts to its own devices.¹

Ever happy to buttress the belief in a netherworld of unspeakable torment, there are even modern tales of Hell's reality—never mind those told from the pulpit, there are others.

Take, for instance the recent urban myth from Siberia that miners accidentally caught a recording of Hell, complete with screaming supplications from its tortured inhabitants. Allegedly, nine miles below the surface of the Earth, a microphone was dropped into this Hell Hole, and caught the voices. It wasn't long before the Trinity Broadcasting company claimed it as proof of the existence of Satan's realm. Some Christian sites on the Internet even acknowledged it as a hoax, but only because they said Hell was a real place, but in the spirit world, and not on Earth. Some adherents can justify anything.

¹ Thomas Sheehan. "The First Coming: How the Kingdom of God Became Christianity." (Random House; 1st ed., 12 September 1986).



The Metaphor of Hell

"I wish to propose for the reader's favourable consideration a doctrine which may, I fear, appear wildly paradoxical and subversive. The doctrine in question is this: that it is undesirable to believe a proposition when there is no ground whatever for supposing it true."

~Bertrand Russell

The human psyche is notorious for inventing symbols to represent ideas. It's how the brain is wired. Before our species had language, it had symbols. Pictures that represented ideas, emotions, knowledge, fears. It's an easy transition from symbols into myth. And myths are then propagated to the point that they seem like truth.

Religious people have the perfect setup. The evils and torments they warn about are impossible to disprove, and so there will always be that doubt in the mind of a hesitant believer.

Now, to say that Christian motifs like Hell cannot be disproved, does not automatically mean they are real. The lack of proof against it, doesn't prove the contention. That's a logical fallacy that believers will use to their advantage.

This fallacy, you will recall from *Cosmology of Christianity*, the section *The AI of Theists*, where I related Bill O'Reilly's aggravating and arrogant interview with Richard Dawkins; in logical and philosophical circles, it's known as The Argument From Ignorance, or in the Latin version, *argumentum ad ignorantiam*, meaning "appeal to ignorance." It claims that a premise is true simply because it has yet to be proven false, or that, conversely, it is false simply because it hasn't been

proven true.

The understanding of this logical fallacy is often predicated on the intelligence and intellectual honesty of the individual. Just as Pastor Peanut, (in the *Cosmology of Christianity* volume), could not comprehend the mistakes in her logic, so many religious adherents also fall prey to it, merely because they haven't developed their thinking skills to the point where they can recognize it. Another reason why education is crucial to living a life of intellectual honesty.

Yet, there are many educated people who still believe in the fantastical tales that embody Christendom. Thus, when I say education and intelligence, it is perhaps crucial to signify that I mean the type of education and intelligence that stems from knowing how to think properly, and with logic and reason. No amount of education can inform this type of intelligence, if the student refuses to release the shackles of religious brainwashing.

The result of the brainwashed mind, whether educated or not, is reiteration of tired concepts based on the ignorance of antiquity and the dearth of knowledge.

Accordingly, clergy and other religious people are fond of telling us that Hell is either a punishment for sin, or, in their more enlightened moments, a metaphor that refers to separation from God. The latter version of these two is one step closer to the truth, but not quite in the presence of truth itself. It's sort of in the next room. Behind a locked door. I contend that Hell's metaphor is not so convoluted. The truth is, you can just add another "o" to that statement. Hell is a metaphor that refers to the separation from GOOD.

How many times have we heard of or experienced this exchange:

"Hey. How are you?"

"I'm in Hell."

So a case could be made for the condition of Hell being merely a lack of good, or the presence of bad. *Traffic is Hell today. The root canal I had was Hell.*²

Since the two emotions of guilt and shame are so inextricably tied to these metaphoric concepts, it becomes easy to manipulate the malleable mind.

On some level, all humans, aside from sociopaths, have felt guilt or shame, and feel they should be punished for whatever action or thought that inspired the emotion. This is something engrained in us from an early age, when our parents reprimanded or punished us for wrongdoing, while we were learning the parameters of right and wrong. The fact that God represents the Ultimate Parent Figure, as I've pointed out before, coincides nicely with the dynamic of guilt and shame, and the concept of Hell. And the concept of Satan, allows a psychological juxtaposition as well—the good parent versus the bad parent.

² ...or one could quote the title of a Pat Benatar song, "Hell is for Children." This is both a metaphor and a generous dose of sarcasm, employed as social commentary.



Cultural Punishment

"Much confusion and misunderstanding has been caused through the early translators of the Bible persistently rendering the Hebrew Sheohl and the Greek Hades and Gehenna by the word Hell. The simple transliteration of these words by the translators of the revised editions of the Bible has not sufficed to appreciably clear up this confusion and misconception."

~The Encyclopedia Americana (1956, Vol. XIV, p. 81)

The Egyptian culture was the first to believe in the judgment of souls after death. Indeed, every culture in recorded and oral history has had an evil personification. The concept of the Devil is in no way unique in Christianity.

While the Egyptians believed in immortality, insofar as it meant a life after death, and sought to protect the bodies of their deceased in tombs, in order to navigate the obstacles of Hell, so did the Zoroaster religion. Zoroastrianism, which subjugated minds in the Middle East for a millennium, taught that souls crossed a bridge, from which the evil ones fell into an abyss.

Sheol, in Jewish Scripture was a dark place that souls go to after death, whether they were good or evil. The concept came before the Christian idea. In the Christian New Testament, the word is rendered as Hades.

Overall, though, the concept was one of separation from God, which was considered the ultimate punishment. I would consider that a great relief, but that's just me. How could the absence of God be a negative experience, if you never felt that presence to begin with?

The 4th century philosopher Saint Augustine made the sexual sins, such as lust, the worst of all. Since he denied himself the pleasures of the flesh, he could only

speak of it from a place of frustration.

The suffering caused by disease and famine allowed the common people to imagine what Hell would be like, and clergy were quick to capitalize on this fear by reminding them, and making comparisons in every sermon. The sanctuary became, ironically, a place of fear, though tempting as a theatre, as well. The architecture and artistic renderings added to the drama, and kept damnation uppermost in the minds of adherents. The concept of Hell was compelling, like a horror movie. And once the lost souls would appear, clergy would offer them salvation, convincing them that they could only be spared from this pain and suffering through the church. Thus, the earliest manifestations of the church guided the perceptions of both Satan and his Hell.



Vice And Virtue

"If there is a sin against life, it consists perhaps not so much in despairing of life as in hoping for another life and in eluding the implacable grandeur of this life."

~ Albert Camus

Dante's *The Divine Comedy*, was inspired also by the concept of the Seven Deadly Sins, as he used four of them in his nine circles of Hell. Two was lust, three was gluttony, and five was wrath.

Sometimes referred to as *Cardinal Sins*, the classical list from the Bible had a few more entries, consisting of:

adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, sorcery, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like" (Galatians 5:19-21).

The seven usually referred to, however, were wrath, greed, sloth, pride, lust, envy, and gluttony.³

In an obscure 1908 book, entitled *How One is Not to Be*, Andrew Culbertson suggested we add **fear** and **superstition** to that list. Fear, he allegedly said, amounts to delusional disorder, and superstition is "Belief in things that one does not understand, to the point of giving money to frauds and spiritual confidence men."⁴

Likewise, psychiatrist Karl Menninger, who established the Menninger Foundation, contended that we ought to add **cruelty** and **dishonesty** to that list as well.⁵

³ Scott P. Richert. "What Are the Seven Deadly Sins?" About.com: Catholicism. http://catholicism.about.com/od/beliefsteachings/f/FAQ_Deadly_Sins.htm

⁴ I could find no copy of this book published anywhere, so I am repeating some kind of meme on a plethora of sites that has this information and quote.

⁵ Karl Menninger. *Whatever Became of Sin?* (Bantam Books; 2nd ed., May 1978).

I would probably agree with both these authors.

Paramount within this ideology is the disregarded aspect that all of this "sins" can be attributed merely to human nature, in its darker forms. The Devil does not make us do it. Biology and psychology does.

By way of juxtaposition, the Church offered, by way of Plato and Aristotle, its list of parallel Cardinal Virtues (which most Cardinals apparently don't have). They were: humility, charity, kindness, patience, chastity, temperance, and diligence.⁶

⁶ James Stalker. *The Seven Deadly Sins and the Seven Cardinal Virtues*. (Navpress Publishing Group, 1998).



The Evil Landlord

*“Eve in the garden gives Adam a hard on
And no one will pardon the snake
Look who invents him and later torments him
Then makes us repent our mistakes.”*

~ Christine Anderson

After Hell was successfully embedded in the human consciousness, the concept evolved. Someone decided that if this underworld existed, it needed a landlord. And the landlord had to be evil.

However, in Isaiah 45:7, we see, "I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil: I the LORD do all these things." If God is indeed capable of creating evil and acting in evil ways, doesn't this make Satan superfluous? Why would an all-powerful God who could be both good and bad, need a bad guy?

If, as the Christians claim, God created the Universe and everything in it, then that would include Satan. The immediate question that arose for me was, if God's answer to the unworthiness and evil of men was met with a giant flood that killed them all, then why didn't he annihilate the Devil when he rebelled in Heaven?

According to Christian underpinnings of belief, Satan had this little slice of real estate called Hell in which to operate his business of tempting humans into his fold, in opposition to God. The Devil would reportedly take the form of a human female, have sex with unsuspecting

men, possibly just for his own entertainment, and then transform again to a human male and have sex with a female, thus implanting the seed of Satan, and interbreeding with humanity.

There have been reports of nuns being attacked by Satan—in the form of priests. No great mystery here; it didn't occur to them until the modern age that maybe they were actually being raped by a priest.

Even so, the overwhelming suggestion was always that women must be careful not to tempt men into the act of forced sexual intercourse, as if this were a possibility. Thus, it was again the woman's fault when a man misbehaved. Christianity used scapegoating as part of its dogma, whether this is admitted openly or not. I contend that at the very least, Satan, in this regard, was merely a representation of the belief that sex was inherently dirty, and maybe also that some men can behave in ways that embody that evil.

Nonetheless, besides the females of our species, Satan is the ultimate scapegoat. Humanity seems to need this being to blame for their own transgressions. Again, this is part and parcel of individuals not taking responsibility for themselves and their actions.

Joseph Conrad said, "The belief in a supernatural source of evil is not necessary; men alone are quite capable of every wickedness."



The Devil is in the Details

*"If the Devil does not exist, and man has therefore created him,
he has created him in his own image and likeness."*

~ Fyodor Dostoyevsky

In compiling the information for this section, I found it comical that the Biography Channel would run a program about Satan—as if he were a real person. More insidious indoctrination and brainwashing?

The visage of Satan largely comes from sources outside the Bible. For instance, the image of him with a forked tail, hooves and horns springs from the Greek god, Pan.

The development of Satan as an individual, rather than a concept, is also attributable to the Persian religion, Zoroastrianism, which taught a dualistic nature to things—good versus evil. It was founded a little before the 6th century BCE, by Zoroaster.⁷

In order to understand how beliefs evolve, it's important to illustrate this one—perhaps in a roundabout way—but tracing beliefs is often a confusing endeavor, since there have been thousands of years of human existence and many more myths and misunderstandings.

To understand the source of the Satan archetype, we have to trace its roots. Rabbinic and apocryphal litera-

⁷ Also known as Zarathustra. This name was used by Nietzsche in one of his famous works: "One of the great German philosopher Fredric Nietzsche's signature works, *Thus Spake Zarathustra* offers a radical revisionist theory of the universe. Zarathustra is a wandering prophet, offering his earth-shattering theories on the nature of time, the existence of God, and humanity's fate. Here we find a mythical embodiment of some of Nietzsche's wildest and most controversial ideas, among them eternal recurrence of events in history and the noble man's obligation to rise above the mediocrity of the world. By no means a simple or straightforward work, this text asks even the most modern of readers to open their minds to a bold vision that challenges the assumptions that seem to hold Western culture together." (Daily Lit).

ture tells us that the figure *Satanail* was the Prince of Grigori, and was cast out of Heaven. From the pseudepigraphic⁸ Book of Enoch:

And they said to me: These are the Grigori, who with their prince Satanail (Satan) rejected the Lord of light, and after them are those who are held in great darkness on the second Heaven, and three of them went down on to Earth from the Lord's throne, to the place Ermon, and broke through their vows on the shoulder of the hill Ermon and saw the daughters of men how good they are, and took to themselves wives, and befouled the Earth with their deeds, who in all times of their age made lawlessness and mixing, and giants are born and marvellous big men and great enmity (2 Enoch 18:3).

The Greek word *egregoroi* translates to The Watchers, who were understood to be a band of fallen angels. The Grigori supposedly mated with human females to produce a hybrid race called the *Nephilim*, the awful giants mentioned in Genesis 6:4, and also as the giants in the Book of Enoch.

...that the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were beautiful; and they took wives for themselves, whomever they chose.

Then the LORD said, "My Spirit shall not strive with man forever, because he also is flesh; nevertheless his days shall be one hundred and twenty years."

The Nephilim were on the Earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore children to them. Those were the mighty men who were of old, men of renown (Genesis 6:2-4).

It says in that verse that the Nephilim were the "sons of God"—which is at once confusing when you also are told that Jesus was the "only begotten son of God." But it's there, confusing or not.

In the Old Testament, these *Nephilim* were said to have

⁸ meaning, a text with unproven authorship. Ironically, that would also be most of the Bible.

survived the flood of Noah, and remained on the Earth.

The concept of otherworldly creatures mating with humans was metamorphed into the conception of the *Incubus* and *Succubus*.

Incubi and Succubi are male and female demons, respectively, and demons are nonhuman forms, often considered fallen angels. Incubi and Succubi have been present in mythology since around the 14th century CE.⁹ The concept is that since demons are not able to reproduce, they found a way around this: A Succubus steals semen from men, gives it to an Incubus, who impregnates a human female with it, and thus, they reproduce themselves through a sort of artificial insemination, using humans as surrogates.¹⁰

In fact, the Legend of Merlin states that he was fathered by an Incubus, as were many other mythical gods and heroes.¹¹ Scholars believe that the myths of Incubi and Succubi originated in the medieval era, when odd, unfamiliar events needed explanation. For instance, if a man had a nocturnal emission (wet dream), they could explain this by saying he was visited by a Succubi in the night.¹² Thus, there would be no guilt involved since he was asleep and had no choice in the matter. In more sinister ways, in history and even today, priests who molest or rape nuns, conveniently blame this on a demon, i.e., an Incubus, in order to avoid culpability for their actions.

Now, in biblical Scripture, there was a more direct

⁹ American Psychological Association (APA). s.v. "succubus." Online Etymology Dictionary. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/succubus>.

¹⁰ James R. Lewis and Evelyn Dorothy Oliver. *Angels A to Z*. s.v. "Incubi and Succubi." (Visible Ink Press, 1996), 218-219.

¹¹ Lacy, Norris J. (1991). "Merlin". In Norris J. Lacy, *The New Arthurian Encyclopedia*, pp. 322. (New York: Garland, 1991).

¹² Heinrich Kramer and James Sprenger, "Here Follows the Way whereby Witches copulate with those devils known as Incubi." *The Malleus Maleficarum or, The Hammer of Witches* (1486). trans. Montague Summers. (Forgotten Books, 7 May 2008), Ch. IV, 177-182.

application of this, as the *Nephilim* simply came down to Earth and had sexual relations with women.

How does this information pull together to explain the Satan myth? I'll let Richard Stromer, Ph. D.¹³ elucidate the subject, thus:

While the idea of divine entities who are essentially destructive in nature is as old as myth, the particular figure of Satan as he appears within Christian theology is not much older than Christianity itself. The emergence of the Christian Satan and his fallen host was the result of a complex theological and mythological process and one with very eclectic prototypes, ranging from the Sumerian Huwawa, the Assyrian Humbaba, and the Babylonian Tiamat to the Zoroastrian Ahirman, the Egyptian Set, and the Canaanite Mot. However, while the Book of Numbers refers to a mysterious demonic figure called "Azazel"—the entity to whom the infamous "scapegoat" of atonement was supposed dedicated and sent out into the desert to meet—the Christian version of Satan appears nowhere in the canon of the Old Testament. Indeed, the original version of this figure as he appears in the Book of Job is simply called "ha-Satan," a Hebrew descriptive title simply meaning "the adversary." The nature of this term as it is used in the Book of Job, observes Harold Bloom, reflects a sort of "court title, akin to our 'prosecuting attorney'". The Greek term for an "adversary" or "accuser," as it turns out, is *diabolos*, the root term from which Satan derived his other name, the Devil.¹⁴

So, ha-Satan, which means an adversary, became Satan, THE adversary.

Satan, as we understand him today, did not exist until the last three centuries BCE—meaning, three centuries before Christ. When the dualism of Zoroastrianism became common, there was then a separation, a good-

¹³ Stromer says on his site, personalmyths.com, he holds "a doctorate in mythological studies and world sacred tradition as viewed from the perspective of depth psychology." My area of specialization is in the application of Personal Mythology to issues of psychological and spiritual development."

¹⁴ Richard Stromer. "On Satan, Demons, and Daimons: An Archetypal Exploration." Personal Myths. <http://www.personalmyths.com/essays.htm>.

against-evil mentality. Thus, God became all-good and Satan became all-bad. But as we have seen, this contradicts many of the other things we know of Christian dogma, and it does so because the concept came much later and was a kind of revisionist history.

The name "Satan" itself comes from a Hebrew word, *satan*, (sah-TAHN) which is a verb and means "to oppose." You will all remember from grade school English that a verb shows action or a state of being. This is very different from a noun, which is a person, place or thing. Thus, Satan was at first a behavior (verb) and then it became an actual entity (noun).

The Fall of Satan begins in several places, depending on what reference you use.



Lucifer Who?

*"As scarce as truth is, the supply has always been
in excess of the demand."*

~Henry Wheeler Shaw AKA Josh Billings

The confusion about the names Lucifer and Satan arise from the belief most Christians have that the two are the same, with different names; that Satan was called Lucifer when he was an angel in Heaven, and after his Fall, he became known as Satan. This is a complete fiction.

Most of this derives from Isaiah 14, beginning with verse 12. This confusion likely developed with the King James Version, where the verse reads,

How art thou fallen from Heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!

In most other translations, we get the Hebrew version, which is,

How you have fallen from Heaven, O star of the morning, son of the dawn!

The name Lucifer is from the Latin word *lucem ferre*, which means "bringer, or bearer, of light." The Old Testament, as we know, was written in Hebrew. The 47 scholars who were authorized by King James I to transcribe the Bible, used unreliable copies of the original texts, as well as some that included Saint Jerome's Latin Vulgate translation. Even the front of most KJV versions have this declaration: "Translated out of the original tongues and with the former translations diligently compared and revised."

So this is an artifact of the Latin language, and is not even in reference to Satan, but to a Babylonian King.

The same words, *lucem ferre*, are used in the Second Book of Peter to refer to Jesus. Are we to believe that Je-

sus was also named Lucifer?

If you read the verse in context, there are plenty of clues to tell you who this section was referring to (emphasis mine):

You have been cut down to the Earth, **You who have weakened the nations!** "But you said in your heart, 'I will ascend to Heaven; I will raise my throne above the stars of God, And I will **sit on the mount of assembly In the recesses of the north.** 'I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will make myself like the Most High.' Nevertheless you will be thrust down to Sheol, To the recesses of the pit. "Those who see you will gaze at you, They will ponder over you, saying, 'Is this **the man** who made the Earth tremble, Who shook kingdoms, Who made the world like a wilderness And overthrew its cities, Who **did not allow his prisoners to go home?**' **All the kings of the nations lie in glory, Each in his own tomb. "But you have been cast out of your tomb** Like a rejected branch, Clothed with the slain who are pierced with a sword, Who go down to the stones of the pit Like a trampled corpse. "You will not be united with them in burial, Because **you have ruined your country, You have slain your people.** May the offspring of evildoers not be mentioned forever (Isaiah 14:12-20).

Notice that all these references are to a human. A king, who mistreated his office, duties and people. This king will not be buried in a tomb with other kings, and has been cast out of that tomb. Satan would not be buried in a tomb, nor buried at all because Satan is a spiritual being, not a human. You can't bury a spirit.

The same is true for the oft-quoted verse in Luke 10:18, cited as supporting evidence. *"I was watching Satan fall from Heaven like lightning."* The same mistake was made there. Refer to:

THE EERDMANS BIBLE DICTIONARY, 1987, page 267, (heading Daystar, no listing of Lucifer) "Another name for the morning star (cf. 2 Pet. 1:19; Rev. 2:28) or the planet Venus, which appears in the sky before the sun. At Isa. 14:12 the Babylonian

ruler is compared to a "Day star" (NIV "morning star"), which has fallen from Heaven and has been felled like a stately tree. Though the Church Fathers associated this verse with the fall of Satan from Heaven (cf. KJV "Lucifer"), it actually speaks of the end of tyranny rather than a prelude to it, as with Satan who after the fall still retained much power. Some commentators link this idea with an ancient myth about the banishment of a divine person from Heaven. The New Testament, which contains Jesus' remark about the fall of Satan (Luke 10:18), does not identify Lucifer with Satan. Instead, the author of 2 Peter suggests that the "morning star" (Gk. Phosphoros "light bearer") refers to Christ's second coming, while the aged John possibly alludes to Christ, who will support the church at Thyatira (Rev. 2:28, Gk. Aster proinos; cf 22:16).

EASTONS BIBLE DICTIONARY 1897. LUCIFER brilliant star, a title given to the king of Babylon (Isaiah 14:12) to denote his glory.

JOHN WESLEY'S NOTES ON THE WHOLE BIBLE THE OLD TESTAMENT by John Wesley 1765.12. Fallen—From the height of thy glory. Lucifer—Which properly is a bright star, that ushers in the morning; but is here metaphorically taken for the mighty king of Babylon.

MATTHEW HENRY'S COMMENTARY ON THE WHOLE BIBLE CONDENSED VERSION 1710.

CLARKE'S COMMENTARY THE OLD TESTAMENT, VOLUME 4 ISAIAH THROUGH MALACHI by Adam Clarke 1826.

Thus, this pervasive misunderstanding among Christians is predicated on a translation error.



The Fall of Satan

"Until the content of a belief is made clear, the appeal to accept the belief on faith is beside the point, for one would not know what one has accepted. The request for the meaning of a religious belief is logically prior to the question of accepting that belief on faith or to the question of whether that belief constitutes knowledge."

~ W. T. Blackstone

As for the actual "Fall" of Satan, this is also not biblical, as there is no reference to his fall that cannot be explained in the same way, through understanding what the language and meaning really were. The ideas about the Fall of Satan came from other sources. Such as the Book of Adam (12.1-14.3)

12.1 the Devil began to cry with forced tears and the Devil told Adam, "O Adam, all the greed and the anger and all the grief of my heart are directed against you because it was through you that I fell from my dwellings, (it was) by you that I was alienated from my own throne. My wings were more numerous than those of the Cherubim, and I concealed myself under them. Because of you, now my feet walk on the earth, which I would never have believed." 12.2 Adam replied to the Devil and told him, 12.3 "What is my fault, by which I have done all that to you?" 13.1 The Devil replied to him and told him, "You did nothing to me, but it is because of you that I have fallen upon the Earth." 13.2 The very day when you were created, on that day, I fell from before the face of God, because when God breathed a spirit onto your face, you had the image and likeness of the divinity. And then Michael came; he presented you and made you bend down before God. And God told Michael, "I have created Adam according to (my) image and my divinity." 14.1 Then Michael came; he summoned all the troops of angels and told them, "Bow down before the likeness and the image of the divinity." 14.2 And then, when Michael summoned them and all had bowed down to you, he summoned me also. 14.3 And I told him,

"Go away from me, for I shall not bow down to him who is younger than me; indeed, I am master prior to him and it is proper for him to bow down to me. 15.1 The six classes of other angels heard that and my speech pleased them and they did not bow down to you.

The reference to the Fall of Satan being due to jealousy of Adam can also be found in the Islamic tradition. (Iblis is the Devil or Satan).

(Iblis) said: I am better than him. Thou createdst me of fire while him Thou didst create of mud.

He said: Then go down hence! It is not for thee to show pride here, so go forth! Lo! thou art of those degraded (Koran 7:10-13).

Therefore, there are three falsehoods within the widespread Christian beliefs regarding Satan: (1) that Satan and Lucifer are the same person, and (2) that Satan was cast out of Heaven, and (3) that Satan Fell because he was jealous of Adam. None of these are what the Bible teaches.